

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant has read and considered the Office Action dated July 18, 2005, and the references cited therein. Claims 1-23 are pending in the application before entry of this amendment. This amendment amends claims 1, 5, 7, and 8, and cancels claims 3, 4, and 19-23.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-15 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(1st para.) as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

However, to forward prosecution, claim 1 has been amended and claims 21-23 have been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended to point out the flexible member and to point out that the effective anchor point is proximate to a contact point between the flexible member and a cam surface.

Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 and its dependant claims are allowable over the 112 rejection and request this rejection be removed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1-4, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,636,578 to *Dieter*. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Section 102 rejection is proper if, and only if, each and every element as set forth in the claims is found – i.e., the prior art must teach every aspect of the claim. See *Verdegaall Bros. v. Oil Co. of Company*, 918 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987); see also M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Dieter does not teach or suggest a combination as recited by independent claim 1 and its dependent claims. For example, claim 1 recites a combination, having an “effective anchor point [that] is defined as a point on the line of action proximate to a contact point between the flexible member and a cam surface.” *Dieter* does not teach or suggest such a combination. Therefore,

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claim 1, and its dependant claims, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Dieter* be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-15, 19, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,460,175 to *Beckworth, et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,335,451 to *Druzynski*. The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. See M.P.E.P. § 2142.

Neither *Beckworth* nor *Druzynski*, either separately or in combination, teach or suggest the combination recited by claim 1 and its dependent claims. For example, claim 1 recites an “effective anchor point [that] is defined as a point on the line of action proximate to a contact point between the flexible member and a cam surface.” Both *Beckworth* and *Druzynski* have fixed anchor points where the spring attaches to the assembly upon which it is connected. The movement of the devices of both *Beckworth* and *Druzynski* does not introduce an “effective anchor point [that] is defined as a point on the line of action proximate to a contact point between the flexible member and a cam surface. Because *Beckworth* in view of *Druzynski* does not teach or suggest that the combination recited by claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that claim 1 and its dependent claims have the rejections removed under 35 U.S.C. § 1.03 under *Beckworth* in view of *Druzynski*.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants thank the examiner for finding the allowable subject matter in claims 16-18 and allowing those claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the application are believed in order, and such action is earnestly solicited. Should any additional fees be necessary to enter and consider this amendment, please charge our deposit account no. 50-2036. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite issuance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (202) 861-1792.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



P. Alan Larson
Registration No. 53,184

Date: 10/18/05
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304
Tel: (202) 861-1682
Fax: (202) 861-1783